

Annex 1. Local Government Self-Assessment Tool for Disaster Resilience

Why use the Local Government Self-Assessment Tool?

Using the Local Government Self-Assessment Tool will help to set baselines, identify gaps, plan actions and have comparable data across local governments, within the country and globally, to measure advancements over time. By using this universal tool, cities and local governments can argue for priority setting and budget allocations within the city council and with the national government.

The main purpose of the Local Government Self-Assessment Tool is to:

- Help local governments engage with different stakeholders to map and understand existing gaps and challenges in disaster risk reduction in their city or locality.
- Set a baseline and develop status reports for cities and municipalities that have committed to the Making Cities Resilient Campaign and its Ten Essentials.
- Complement information gathered through the national Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) monitoring system by providing local-level information. Cities can choose to share their results with national HFA focal points as part of the national reporting process.

Who conducts the review process?

To be effective, the self assessment should be undertaken as a multi-stakeholder process, led by local governments. The main actors include local government authorities, civil society organisations, local academia, the business community and community-based organisations, with the support of national entities as needed. The involvement of civil society organisations and community-based organisations is essential to the success of this process.

How will the review process work?

Locally-specific indicators: The results of the self-assessment will be recorded in a web-based online system, which can also be used offline if the local government prefers. The online system and template were developed by UNISDR, in consultation with several partners, including ICLEI, local government representatives, and representatives of the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR).

The online version includes local-context indicators, presented as “key questions,” each of which are assessed on a scale from 1 to 5 (Key Questions are found in Table A.2 below; the assessment scale is in Table A.1). Key questions are aligned to the HFA priority areas and core indicators (see Table A.3) as well as to the Ten Essentials of the Making Cities Resilient. The self-assessment will enrich the national HFA review process and the online profile of local governments participating in the Making Cities Resilient Campaign. The self-assessment is suggested to coincide with the national HFA monitoring cycle, and be undertaken every two years.

Online Local Government Self-Assessment Tool: The online HFA monitoring system is hosted on the website www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring. It can also be accessed through the Campaign website www.unisdr.org/campaign. Access to the online system requires a registration process, facilitated by the UNISDR regional offices and the respective national focal point for disaster risk reduction. Each local government user will be provided a unique user ID and password to access the system. Detailed guidelines on the local government self assessment tool are also available online.

TABLE A.1: Scoring Scale - Level of Progress

The status and level of progress in the self-assessment shall be measured on a scale of 1-5, which will help score progress over time. More guidance is available online.

LEVEL OF PROGRESS	DESCRIPTION OF LEVEL OF PROGRESS FOR OVERALL RANKING FOR EACH QUESTION (add narrative comments on context and challenges)
5	Comprehensive achievement has been attained, with the commitment and capacities to sustain efforts at all levels.
4	Substantial achievement has been attained, but with some recognised deficiencies in commitment, financial resources or operational capacities.
3	There is some institutional commitment and capacities to achieving DRR, but progress is not comprehensive or substantial.
2	Achievements have been made but are incomplete, and while improvements are planned, the commitment and capacities are limited.
1	Achievements are minor and there are few signs of planning or forward action to improve the situation.

Table A.2:

Key Questions for Self-Assessment based on the “Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient”

The column “Ten Essentials” includes the number(s) of the HFA priority(ies) to which each Essential corresponds. The numbers following each “Key Question” in this table [i.e.: 1.1] point to the corresponding HFA Core Indicators in table A.3. The full system—aligning “key questions” and “core indicators”—is available online, with additional guidelines.

TEN ESSENTIALS	KEY QUESTIONS PER ESSENTIAL [Numbers following each question indicate references to HFA Core Indicators]
<p>ESSENTIAL 1:</p> <p>Put in place organization and coordination to clarify everyone’s roles and responsibilities</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITY 1]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How well are local organizations (including local government) equipped with capacities (knowledge, experience, official mandate) for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation? [1.1] 2. To what extent do partnerships exist between communities, private sector and local authorities to reduce risk? [1.1] 3. How much does the local government support vulnerable local communities (particularly women, elderly, infirmed, children) to actively participate in risk reduction decision making, policy making, planning and implementation processes? [1.3] 4. To what extent does the local government participate in national DRR planning? [1.4] 5. To what extent does the local government have access to adequate financial resources to carry out risk reduction activities? [1.2]
<p>ESSENTIAL 2:</p> <p>Assign a budget and provide incentives for homeowners, low-income families and the private sector to invest in risk reduction</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITIES 1 AND 4]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. To what degree does the local government allocate sufficient financial resources to carry out DRR activities, including effective disaster response and recovery? [1.2] 7. What is the scope of financial services (e.g. saving and credit schemes, macro and micro-insurance) available to vulnerable and marginalised households for pre-disaster times? [4.2] 8. To what extent are microfinancing, cash aid, soft loans, loan guarantees, etc. available to affected households after disasters to restart livelihoods? [4.2] 9. How well established are economic incentives for investing in disaster risk reduction for households and businesses (e.g. reduced insurance premiums for households, tax holidays for businesses)? [4.3] 10. To what extent do local business associations, such as chambers of commerce and similar, support efforts of small enterprises for business continuity during and after disasters? [4.3]
<p>ESSENTIAL 3:</p> <p>Update data on hazards and vulnerabilities, prepare and share risk assessments</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITIES 2 and 3 AND 4]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. To what degree does the local government conduct thorough disaster risk assessments for key vulnerable development sectors in your local authority? [2.1] 12. To what extent are these risk assessments regularly updated, e.g. annually or on a bi-annual basis? [2.1] 13. How regularly does the local government communicate to the community information on local hazard trends and risk reduction measures (e.g. using a Risk Communications Plan), including early warnings of likely hazard impact? [3.1] 14. How well are local government risk assessments linked to, and supportive of, risk assessments from neighbouring local authorities and state or provincial government risk management plans? [2.4] 15. How well are disaster risk assessments incorporated into all relevant local development planning on a consistent basis? [2.1]

<p>ESSENTIAL 4:</p> <p>Invest in and maintain risk reducing infrastructure, such as storm drainage</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITIES 4]</p>	<p>16. How far do land use policies and planning regulations for housing and development infrastructure take current and projected disaster risk (including climate related risks) into account? [4.1]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing • communication • transportation • energy
<p>ESSENTIAL 5:</p> <p>Assess the safety of all schools and health facilities and upgrade these as necessary</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITIES 2, 4 AND 5]</p>	<p>17. How adequately are critical public facilities and infrastructure located in high-risk areas assessed for all hazard risks and safety? [4.4]</p>
<p>ESSENTIAL 6:</p> <p>Enforce risk compliant building regulations and land use planning, identify safe land for low-income citizens</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITY 4]</p>	<p>18. How adequate are the measures being taken to protect critical public facilities and infrastructure from damage during disasters? [4.4]</p>
<p>ESSENTIAL 7:</p> <p>Ensure education programmes and training on disaster risk reduction are in place in schools and communities</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITIES 1, 3 AND 5]</p>	<p>19. To what extent have local schools, hospitals and health facilities received special attention for “all hazard” risk assessments in your local authority? [2.1]</p> <p>Tick boxes: Schools Hospitals/ health facilities</p>
	<p>20. How safe are all main schools, hospitals and health facilities from disasters so that they have the ability to remain operational during emergencies [2.1]</p> <p>Tick boxes: Schools Hospitals/ health facilities</p>
	<p>21. To what degree do local government or other levels of government have special programs in place to regularly assess schools, hospitals and health facilities for maintenance, compliance with building codes, general safety, weather-related risks etc.? [4.6]</p> <p>Tick boxes: Schools Hospitals/ health facilities</p>
	<p>22. How far are regular disaster preparedness drills undertaken in schools, hospitals and health facilities?[5.2]</p> <p>Tick boxes: Schools Hospitals/ health facilities</p>
	<p>23. How well enforced are risk-sensitive land use regulations, building codes, and health and safety codes across all development zones and building types? [4.1]</p>
	<p>24. How strong are existing regulations (e.g. land use plans, building codes, etc.) to support disaster risk reduction in your local authority? [4.1]</p> <p>Tick boxes: programs include cultural diversity issues programs are sensitive to gender perspectives</p>
	<p>25. How regularly does the local government conduct awareness-building or education programs on DRR and disaster preparedness for local communities? [1.3]</p>
	<p>26. To what extent does the local government provide training in risk reduction for local officials and community leaders? [1.3]</p>
	<p>27. To what degree do local schools and colleges include courses, education or training in disaster risk reduction (including climate-related risks) as part of the educational curriculum? [3.2]</p>
	<p>28. How aware are citizens of evacuation plans or drills for evacuations when necessary? [5.2]</p>

<p>ESSENTIAL 8:</p> <p>Protect ecosystems and natural buffers to mitigate hazards, adapt to climate change</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITY 4]</p>	<p>29. How well integrated are the DRR policies, strategies and implementation plans of local government into existing environmental development and natural resource management plans? [4.1]</p> <p>30. To what degree does the local government support the restoration, protection and sustainable management of ecosystems services? [4.1]</p> <p>Tick appropriate boxes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • forests • coastal zones • wetlands • water resources • river basins • fisheries <p>31. To what degree do civil society organizations and citizens participate in the restoration, protection and sustainable management of ecosystems services? [4.1]</p> <p>32. To what degree does the private sector participate in the implementation of environmental and ecosystems management plans in your local authority? [4.1]</p>
<p>ESSENTIAL 9:</p> <p>Install early warning systems and emergency management capacities</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITIES 2 AND 5]</p>	<p>33. To what degree do local institutions have access to financial reserves to support effective disaster response and early recovery? [5.3]</p> <p>34. To what extent are early warning centres established, adequately staffed (or on-call personnel) and well resourced (power back ups, equipment redundancy etc) at all times? [2.3]</p> <p>35. How much do warning systems allow for adequate community participation? [2.3]</p> <p>36. To what extent does the local government have an emergency operations centre (EOC) and/or an emergency communication system? [5.2]</p> <p>37. How regularly are training drills and rehearsals carried out with the participation of relevant government, non-governmental, local leaders and volunteers? [5.2]</p> <p>38. How available are key resources for effective response, such as emergency supplies, emergency shelters, identified evacuation routes and contingency plans at all times? [5.2]</p> <p>Tick boxes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stockpiles of relief supplies • Emergency shelters • Safe evacuation routes identified • Contingency plan or community disaster preparedness plan for all major hazards
<p>ESSENTIAL 10:</p> <p>Ensure that the needs and participation of the affected population are at the centre of reconstruction</p> <p>[HFA PRIORITIES 4 AND 5]</p>	<p>39. How much access does the local government have to resources and expertise to assist victims of psycho-social (psychological, emotional) impacts of disasters? [5.3]</p> <p>40. How well are disaster risk reduction measures integrated into post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation activities (i.e. build back better, livelihoods rehabilitation)? [4.5]</p> <p>41. To what degree does the Contingency Plan (or similar plan) include an outline strategy for post-disaster recovery and reconstruction, including needs assessments and livelihoods rehabilitation? [5.2]</p>

TABLE A.3: HFA National Core Indicators

Table A.3 presents the Core Indicators of the five action priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action that national governments use to monitor progress (see more at: www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring). The right-hand column shows which Key Question from Table A.1 contributes to which of these HFA Core Indicators (these are linked online).

NATIONAL HFA CORE INDICATORS (CI) BY PRIORITY OF ACTION	Local Key Questions (see Table A.1)
HFA Priority for Action 1: Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation CI 1.1. National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.	1, 2, 3, 4
CI 1.2. Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels.	5, 6
CI 1.3. Community participation and decentralisation are ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels.	3, 25, 26
CI. 1.4. A national multi-sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.	4
HFA Priority for Action 2: Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning CI 2.1. National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk.	11, 12, 15, 19, 20
CI 2.2. Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities.	
CI 2.3. Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.	34 35
CI 2.4. National and local risk assessments take account of regional and trans-boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.	14
HFA Priority for Action 3: Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels CI 3.1. Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems, etc.).	13
CI 3.2. School curricula, education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices.	27
CI 3.3. Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.	
CI 3.4. Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.	
HFA Priority for Action 4: Reduce the underlying risk factors CI 4.1. Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment-related policies and plans, including for land use, natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.	16, 23, 24, 29, 30, 31 32
CI 4.2. Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.	7, 8

CI 4.3. Economic and productive sectoral policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities.	9 10
CI 4.4. Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.	17, 18
HFA Priority for Action 5: Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels	
CI 5.1. Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective, are in place.	1
CI 5.2. Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.	22, 28, 36, 37, 38, 41
CI 5.3. Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required.	33, 39
CI 5.4. Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.	